

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 NML CAPITAL, LTD.,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 REPUBLIC OF ARGENTINA, *et al.* ,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-00492-RFB-VCF

ORDER

12
13 Before the Court is the Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 305) and Motion for Sanctions
14 (ECF No. 243). The Court grants the Motion for Clarification and denies the Motion for Sanctions.

15 The Court does not find that there is sufficient evidence to find that M.F. Corporate
16 Services (“MF Nevada”) or Mossack Fonseca engaged in a willful abuse of the discovery process.
17 Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper, 447 U.S. 752, 766 (1980). The Court does not find that the so-
18 called “Panama Papers” are sufficiently reliable or persuasive to establish sanctionable conduct by
19 MF Nevada or Mossack Fonseca. MF Nevada actually participated in and produced documents in
20 discovery. MF Nevada raised plausible and appropriate objections to certain discovery demands
21 while still providing information and documents. Mossack Fonseca raised legitimate objections
22 to legal arguments by the Plaintiff as well as appropriate jurisdictional arguments. Based upon
23 these findings and the record here, the Court does not find either entity engaged in willful or bad
24 faith conduct during discovery. Consequently, the Court denies the Motion for Sanctions.

25 Accordingly,

26 **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant’s Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 305) is GRANTED.

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. 243) is DENIED.
This case shall remain closed.

DATED: March 27, 2019.



RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE